

### Remarks

The Applicants wish to express appreciation to the examiner and to the supervisor for the interview of February 5, 2008. The Applicants found the comments provided in the interview to be very helpful in providing the attached claim amendments.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1-18 are cancelled, and entry of new claims 19-37 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under section 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0082978 to Ghouri et al. ("Ghouri"). Ghouri teaches a reverse auction where a customer provides automobile requirements and preferences and sellers bid for the customer's business. Ghouri, abstract. Ghouri allows a customer to select options to configure a desired automobile. A customer may select year, make, model, trim, color, and other options. Ghouri, figures 2-5 and accompanying text. Dealers then attempt to match the desired automobile with one that they may have in inventory and provide a competitive bid. Thus, the desired automobile may not even exist or presently be available in a dealer inventory.

The pending application discloses a method of providing different views of the same specific tangible object. The different views may vary based on the attributes of the object that are provided.

Independent claims 19, 25, and 32 all recite a specific tangible object in inventory and having attributes. The object has existing attributes which are entered into a database. In contrast, Ghouri teaches a "wish list" of customer preferences which may be altered as a user desires because the automobile does not, in fact, exist.

Independent claim 19 further recites:

applying a first rule associated with the first venue to generate a first view of the specific tangible object, the first view including only attributes in compliance with the first rule;

...

applying a second rule associated with the second venue to generate a second view of the specific tangible object, the second view including only attributes in compliance with the second rule, and wherein the second view differs from the first view in that at least one attribute in the second view is not in the first view

Claim 19 requires first and second views of the same tangible object. The second view differs from the first view by at least one attribute. Thus, a feature, option, price, etc., may be seen in one view, but not in another view. Support is found for claim 19 in each figure of the pending application and the accompanying text.

The different views of the same object are not taught or suggested in Ghouri and, indeed, defeats the purpose of Ghouri. In Ghouri, dealers must have the same information on a desired vehicle in order to match the desired vehicle and provide effective bids. If a first dealer sees an option for 4-wheel drive and a second dealer does not, the second dealer will provide an unsatisfactory match and bid. Other options would likewise prove to be unworkable if dealers are viewing different options on a desired vehicle. Thus, Ghouri fails to anticipate claim 19.

Claim 25 recites:

storing a first attribute having first and second values in a database, the first attribute corresponding to the specific tangible object;

...

applying a first rule associated with the first venue to generate a first view of the specific tangible object, the first view comprising the first attribute and including the first value and excluding the second value in compliance with the first rule;

...

applying a second rule associated with the second venue to generate a second view of the specific tangible object, the second view comprising the first

attribute and including the second value, different from the first value, and excluding the first value in compliance with the second rule.

Claim 25 recites an attribute with first and second values. A first view is allowed to see a first value of the attribute, and a second view is allowed to see a second value of the attribute. Support is found for these limitations in paragraph [0032] of the pending application. In one example, the attribute may be price which has a corresponding monetary value. A retail venue may view a retail price while a wholesale venue views a wholesale price.

Ghouri has absolutely no teaching or suggestion of allowing dealers to see different values of the same attribute of the same automobile. To do so would defeat the dealers' ability to effectively bid for the desired automobile. For example, if the attribute is "year of manufacture" and dealers were supplied different years, then the responding price bids are likely to be significantly different.

Claim 32 recites:

receiving a first request from a first venue for information on the specific tangible objects in inventory and comprising attributes, wherein each specific tangible object includes an attribute having an identifier;

applying a first rule associated with the first venue to generate a first view of the objects, the first view including only those objects with identifiers that are in compliance with the first rule;

...

applying a second rule associated with the second venue to generate a second view of the objects, the second view including only those objects with identifiers that are in compliance with the second rule such that the first view and second view include different objects.

Claim 32 requires that each object include an identifier. The first and second views are allowed to include objects with complying identifiers. Support is found for these limitations in paragraph [0038] of the pending application. In one example, the

identifier may be the make of an automobile. Thus, if an automobile's make is "Ford," the automobile may be viewable for a Ford-associated venue. However, the same automobile may be excluded from a Honda-associated venue.

Ghouri has no teaching or suggestion of including or excluding different objects from dealer views based on identifiers. Once again, to do so would defeat the purpose of Ghouri. Ghouri teaches that all dealers are able to see the desired automobile regardless of which attribute has been selected.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 19, 25, and 32 as Ghouri fails to identically teach every element as presented herein. An anticipation under section 102 is proper only if the reference shows exactly what is claimed. Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim). As claims 20-24, 26-31, and 33-37 depend from the respective independent claims discussed above, they likewise represent patentable subject matter.

In the event the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding the foregoing election, please contact the undersigned attorney. Please also contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in the event that any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of this application is found, which could be clarified by a telephone interview, or which may be overcome through an Examiner's Amendment.

DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

By /John R. Thompson/  
John R. Thompson  
Registration No. 40,842

STOEL RIVES LLP  
One Utah Center Suite 1100  
201 S Main Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904  
Telephone: (801) 328-3131  
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999